

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/426,792

Applicant(s)
Mangano

Examiner
Phyllis G. Spivack

Group Art Unit
1614



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Phyllis G. Spivack

(3) _____

(2) Rahul Pathak

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 30, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-16 and 49-55

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The possibility of limiting the claims to pharmacologic cardiovascular agents that are beta blocking agents as recited on page 7 of the specification was suggested by the Examiner. This limitation will be considered by Applicant.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Phyllis Spivack

PHYLLIS SPIVACK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.